DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 271 UD 018 560

AUTHOR McClain, Shirla R.; Spencer, Norma L.
TITLE Obstacles to Multiculturalism: The Community, Higher Education Institutions and the Schools.
PUB DATE Jun 78
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented to the Congress on Education (1st, Toronto, June 1978); Not available in hard copy due to author's restriction

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Cross Cultural Training; *Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Differences; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnicity; *Ethnocentrism; Higher Education; Racism; Social Change
IDENTIFIERS *Multicultural Education

ABSTRACT

Lack of commitment, lack of knowledge, and lack of leadership allow contradictions between what is professed (appreciation of cultural diversity) and what is practiced (Anglo-oriented monoculturalism) in American education today. The traditional melting pot philosophy has failed to respect ethnic differences, and has consequently resulted in a polarized society and school systems and universities. Multicultural education (MCE) is the first step toward reversing this situation. Without MCE, those in politics, business, civic organizations, churches, the media and the general populace will continue to operate in an ethnocentric way. In order to remove these obstacles, each sector of society must make MCE a high priority, vote for leaders commited to multiculturalism, implement inservice programs, and conduct research that focuses on the positive effects of multicultural environments and teaching/learning styles. Multiculturalism can maximize the potential of a community and the nation. (Author/KR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED159271

Obstacles to Multiculturalism: The Community, Higher Education Institutions, and the Schools

Shirla R. McClain

Assistant Professor of Education

Kent State University

and

Norma L. Spencer

Assistant Professor of Education

University of Akron

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Shirla R. McClain

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Paper presented to the First Congress on Education. Toronto, Ontario, June 1978.

UDO 19560

Introduction

Throughout American history "differences have been "valued". The value assigned to them, however, has largely been determined by what types of differences they represented. It appears that differences have received positive values and have been held in high regard when they are associated with material goods or aesthetics. For example, Americans have valued, in a positive way, the differences in automobiles, fashions, houses, restaurants, jewelry, and such. The more unique the product, the more unlike another, the more its value increased. Similarly, the diversity in literature, plays, music, paintings, architectural styles, and such has been valued positively. Writers, musicians, artists, actors and actresses, have sought to give the American public products that are uniquely different; businesses have capitalized on such differences.

By contrast, the diversity that is related to the human condition--specifically differences in people's characteristics, customs, and beliefs--has not been prized nearly so much and such differences have frequently been assigned negative values, particularly the cultural differences of America's poor and/or minority groups.

In regard to America's ethnic groups, emphasis has historically been placed upon conformity. The melting pot theory was espoused and the nation's immigrant populations were to be assimilated into the American culture. Thus, differences were to be melted away and American citizens were then to become similar only to each other.

Because strong cultural traditions of racial and ethnic groups were difficult to alter and because the visible minorities were deliberately excluded from the assimilation process, cultural diversity has been and continues to be a fact of life in America. Writers and philosophers acknowledged that reality as early as the turn of the century and advocated the

concept of cultural pluralism.[1]

More recent consequences of the 1960's Civil Rights Movement in the United States have given rise to a movement known as the "new pluralism" wherein differences have become more pronounced and acceptable. Culturally diverse ethnic groups are now seeking to trace their ethnic heritages and to demand equity after years of prejudicial treatment. Yet, the fact remains that the granting of respect for and dignity to the "new pluralism" is almost as rhetorical today as it was over seventy-five years ago when advocates of cultural pluralism implored Americans to respect and dignify differences. The consequences of such rhetoric are evidenced today in a more racially and ethnically polarized society and highly segregated school systems.

It is the purpose of this paper to examine the obstacles to multiculturalism that result from the contradictions between what American society and its educational institutions profess and what they actually practice. An analysis is made of the roles and responsibilities of the community, higher education institutions, and the schools. Specific strategies are then offered to enable a society that is attitudinally monocultural (Anglo-oriented, regardless of class) to practice multiculturalism.

Definition of Multicultural Education

Although a variety of definitions of multicultural education (MCE) have been proposed in the literature, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) in its "No One Model American" statement offers what the writers believe to be the most comprehensive and explicit definition. A portion of that statement reads as follows:

> Multicultural education is education which values cultural pluralism. Multicultural education rejects the view that schools should seek to melt away cultural differences or the view that schools should merely tolerate cultural pluralism. Instead, multicultural education affirms that schools should be oriented toward the cultural enrichment of all

> children and youth through programs rooted to the preservation and extension of cultural alternatives. Multicultural education recognizes cultural diversity as a fact of life in American society, and it affirms that this cultural diversity is a valuable resource that should be preserved and extended. It affirms that major education institutions should strive to preserve and enhance cultural pluralism.
>
> To endorse cultural pluralism is to endorse the principle that there is no one model American. To endorse cultural pluralism is to understand and appreciate the differences as a positive force in the continuing development of a society which professes a wholesome respect for the intrinsic worth of every individual. Cultural pluralism is more than a temporary accommodation to placate racial and ethnic minorities. It is a concept that aims toward a heightened sense of being and of wholeness of the entire society based on the unique strengths of each of its parts.[2]

Thus, the implications of AACTE's multicultural statement embrace the schools, higher education, and the community. The next portion of the paper examines the obstacles to multiculturalism in these three sectors of the society.

Note: The terms cultural pluralism and multiculturalism will be used interchangeably throughout the paper.

Obstacles to Multiculturalism

The Community

Contradictions and Consequences

The contradictions between what is professed and what is actually practiced permeate the various segments of American society. Politicians court the votes of ethnic and racial constituencies and then do not respond to their needs. Business and industry give lip service and/or financial support to minority organizations, but do little to hire or promote minorities within their own employment ranks. (The need for the creation of affirmative action programs is evidence of such discriminatory practices.) Members of civic organizations work to help minorities in a "distant" relationship, but return to their own doorsteps having little interaction or understanding of the people for whom they program.

Churches profess brotherly love; yet, morning worship services reflect one of the most segregated hours throughout the nation. The media cover

top news stories that depict the pervasive injustices being done to America's minorities while their staffing patterns reflect unjust hiring and promotion practices, especially in policy making positions. Private citizens who "are only following the rules"--relying on institutional racism as their reasons--are frequently the persons who vote against fair housing, do not favor integrated schools, and dislike taking orders from minorities who are in superior job positions. The contradictions are endless.

Obstacles

Lack of commitment and knowledge. American citizens have been educated in a monocultural majority society where conformity rather than diversity has been prized. Bent upon maintaining tradition, the American majority has been unwilling to face the reality that our nation is a culturally pluralistic society. Those who are different have been tolerated only as long as they were either few in number or were not in proximity to the majority. Small numbers of racially or ethnically different persons have not usually posed a real threat to neighborhoods nor institutions. It has usually been when sizeable numbers of minorities live in proximity to the dominant majority that serious problems arise. Lacking any substantive knowledge about cultural differences--and relying on stereotypes and myths as substitutes for knowledge--the dominant majority has viewed those who are culturally different as "problematic".

Thus, there has been a general lack of commitment to the concept of cultural pluralism, and the problems of the culturally different have been viewed as "their" problems. In more recent years, however, the problems which have perpetually plagued the lower socioeconomic strata of culturally different groups have manifested themselves in the middle and upper class society. Drug abuse, moral education, anti-smoking campaigns, and environmental pollution are no longer endemic to the lives of lower socioeconomic class minority

populations and have now taken on dimensions deemed significantly important to be addressed in the wider community and thus the schools. Commitment to issues, then, have had a direct relationship to the populations whom the issues have affected. Civil disturbances of the 1960s did indeed affect all segments of American society and therefore should have clearly demonstrated the need for endorsement of the concept of cultural pluralism. Yet this has not been the case.

Lack of leadership. In spite of the potential for leadership empowered in the roles of politicians, businessmen, industrial leaders, civic workers, ministers, media personnel, and private citizens, there has been little sense of responsibility toward endorsement of multiculturalism on their part. Minority leadership, frequently in the form of a "disruptive force" has helped to force the enactment of civil rights legislation and compliance to fair employment practices in business and industry.

Civic organizations, benevolent and secret societies and such have been less vulnerable to forced compliance and have responded frequently in paternalistic efforts of doing for, rather than planning with minorities for the elimination of the true sources of problems, i.e., discrimination, poverty, etc.. Churches, having high visibility and a potential to affect the lives of many, have lacked significant leadership. Their efforts have not been toward the integration of congregations. Rather, churches have sought to work in cooperation with other churches, which have culturally different memberships, to accomplish joint ventures. Media personnel have lacked leadership in that they have not focused on the positive value of cultural pluralism, but have highlighted the disruptions that have occurred when attempts have been made to operationalize cultural pluralism.

While there have been private citizens and individual politicians, busi-

nessmen, industrial leaders, media personnel, and others who take a positive stance in support of cultural pluralism, there has been a general lack of collective leadership. Unfortunately, too many of those who have elected to live among and work with people who are culturally different, or who value such differences, have found themselves at odds with the community at large.

Strategies

Because private citizens are members of all other segments of the community, it is important that they provide leadership within their respective segments. This means that individuals within institutions and/or organizations must make multiculturalism a priority and take a leadership role in decision making within their given institutuions.

Furthermore, in order to become more knowledgeable about the concept of cultural pluralism and to make a commitment to it, individuals in various segments of the community should design and attend ongoing inservice programs to be conducted by university professors/educational personnel/members of their respective segments of the community. The purpose, of course, would be to develop an awareness of the need for multiculturalism with an end toward respecting and dignifying cultural differences and maximizing the potential in the community. Institutuions of higher education could play a significant role in this endeavor. Yet, their own obstacles to MCE must be eradicated. The next portion of the paper examines problems at the university level.

Higher Education

Contradictions and Consequences

Since the demise of the syndrome created through the literary works of Horatio Alger, American society has placed increasing emphasis on education as the route to riches. The nation's public schools have purported to serve children of all citizens, yet the curriculum has reflected and favored the

mystical and mythical "Norm". Those learners with cultural differences who somehow "made it through" public education and into the university found higher education even less responsive to their needs. Thus, the contradiction between the concept of public education and the elitism of higher education is clear: while society has preached to its young people that going to college is the way to "make it" in society, higher education practices have sought to keep its population elite.[3] The debate over and resistance to open admissions, developmental programs, and current "reverse discrimination" practices serve as evidence.

The larger community's perception of the university community as intellectual, all-knowing and research oriented presents further contradictions in light of higher education's practices regarding cultural pluralism. Consequences of such contradictions have produced significant obstacles to cultural pluralism in higher education. These obstacles are addressed in the following portion of the paper.

Obstacles

Lack of commitment and knowledge. There is considerable evidence of a lack of knowledge and/or commitment in the area of practicing cultural pluralism in higher education. First, higher education has responded very reluctantly to pressures from the minority students to institute changes to benefit culturally different learners. Perhaps the most visible changes occurred during the 1960s when demonstrations, protests, and physical confrontations resulted in the institution of a number of ethnic studies programs.

Since such programs were initiated primarily to appease protestors and to ease conflict, they were poorly designed by faculty because of their limited knowledge of the implications of cultural differences. The results were that: 1) curriculum was hastily developed or drawn from existing programs;

2) the scope of general programming was narrow; and 3) few existing faculty were qualified to teach the courses. Moreover, lack of commitment to ethnic studies as an ongoing and integral part of university programming was evidenced by lack of long-range financial planning. Such serious limitations had negative effects on the viability of ethnic studies programs and jeopardized them from their inception. Many of the original programs still do not enjoy "legitimate" status.

Second, lack of knowledge and commitment to the concept of cultural pluralism has permeated virtually all areas of the university. The various schools/colleges/departments within higher education systems have traditionally placed emphasis on building skills with little or no regard for knowledge about the humans on which the skills are practiced. For example, medical schools have graduated doctors with virtually no knowledge of the cultural dimensions of the doctor-patient relationship; the legal profession purports to provide equal representation to all clients, yet minorities and the poor have consistently been victims of injustice by the judicial system; and social workers frequently exhibit "blame the victim" attitudes towards their clients.[4] Psychologists generally have minimal and most often no formal course work which would allow them to understand the relationship between cultural differences and intelligence testing.

A third source of evidence of lack of knowledge and commitment to the concept of cultural pluralism is found in what is perhaps the most critical area in higher education, teacher training. As throughout the university community, administrators, faculty, staff and the student body do not reflect our pluralistic society. Lack of knowledge and commitment to the concept of cultural pluralism is especially crucial to teacher training because the necessary modeling for programs, practices, and personnel is absent. For example, curri-

cular programming is generally devoid of MCE and bilingual education courses, or even references to culturally diverse populations in the existing courses; the curriculum tends to be content oriented with little regard for learning styles as they relate to cultural differences; and there is little or no interdisciplinary involvement.

Furthermore, laboratory and field experiences, particularly those involving culturally diverse populations, have been few and/or introduced late in the trainee's program. Too often teacher training institutions and adjacent school districts have made no concerted effort to establish the long-range, close working relationship needed to benefit trainees, pupils, and significant others. Such efforts are crucial to education that is multicultural.[5]

Finally, lack of commitment and knowledge is evident in the area of research. Pluralism-related research in the university community has tended to be "after-the-fact" rather than preventive research to seek strategies that would help society and the schools to practice the concept of cultural pluralism. It appears then, that higher education personnel have not accepted their roles or carried out their responsibilities in effecting MCE because they lack knowledge and thus commitment to the concept of cultural pluralism.

Lack of leadership. While individuals--administrators and faculty--within the university have made valiant efforts to effect MCE programs, their efforts have generally lacked institutional support and therefore have been largely unsuccessful. By and large, personnel in leadership and decision-making positions have been derelict in their effort to effect MCE. Lack of knowledge, as described earlier in this section, apparently accompanies lack of commitment to MCE and consequently there is limited leadership. However, the three--knowledge, commitment, and leadership--appear to be inextricably bound and no clear-cut order can be delineated. Therefore, the order in which the follow-

ing strategies are presented is not necessarily the order in which events may occur. Obviously, many will take place simultaneously.

Strategies

If changes are to occur, MCE must become a priority in higher education. This requires that Boards of Regents and Trustees, as well as administrators and faculty, must make this determination. Financial commitment, of course, is a prime indicator of priorities. Financial commitment may be manifested in recruiting and hiring of faculty and staff and recruiting and retention of the student body. Multicultural/ethnic/racial personnel and student populations are necessary to provide the modeling climate essential to MCE.

Certain financial commitment is also necessary to the knowledge component involved in strategies. Inservice of university personnel may well be the most significant yet the most sensitive step in the strategies process--for ivory towers are not easily tumbled. However, if higher education is to take a leadership role in inservice efforts for school and community personnel, administrators and faculty must educate themselves--become culturally/ethnically literate. Inservice methods may include: 1) inviting prominent multicultural educators to campus; 2) visiting other universities with MCE programs; 3) intra-university visitations;[6] 4) team teaching; 5) independent study; and 6) attending MCE conferences.

A major undertaking must be curriculum revision and development. Interdisciplinary, departmental, and university cooperation is most desirable since MCE should permeate the entire curriculum.[7] Inservice education can be invaluable in this regard.

It is also essential that universities establish/strengthen/continue close working relationships with local school districts. Laboratory and field experiences for university trainees must be an integral part of MCE efforts.

Finally, research efforts, long a university priority, must place more emphasis on 1) the positive effects of cultural pluralism[8] and 2) the teaching learning process as it relates to cultural differences. Because schools have been oriented to treat children the same, they have proposed equal treatment for all children. The reality of differences, however, can not be overlooked for differences imply not equal, but equivalent treatment. Since equivalent means "equal in value or in a quality that can not be expressed in the same measure, such as meaning, importance, or effect,"[9] it is necessary to educate children in terms of their differences. Such differences will in fact have different meanings, importance, and effects in their lives. Gay cites several studies regarding ethnicity and learning styles;[10] and ethnicity as it relates to communication and learning styles is also addressed in the Sourcebook of Equal Educational Opportunity.[11] Cobbs and Winokur specify cultural styles of teaching and learning.[12]

While many United States institutions of higher learning have developed written philosophies and made verbal commitments to the concept of cultural pluralism, institutional practices have not reflected the written philosophies and verbal commitments. Recently a number of professional organizations, including the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), and The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) have established multicultural education commissions/task forces which have resulted in position statements on the imperatives of MCE.[13] Further, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Standards, effective January 1,1979 include MCE (Standard 2.1.1.).[14] Position statements and accreditation mandates alone however, are grossly inadequate to effect education that is multicultural. Only educational activists unalterably committed to the concept of cultural pluralism can transfer philosophies from paper to practice and transform verbal com-

mitment to model behavior. At stake is America's most precious resource--its youth.

Improvement at the university level should provide future teachers with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to effect MCE. However, today's schools must critically analyze their current obstacles to MCE and work to overcome them. The next segment of the paper addresses this issue.

The Schools

Contradictions and Consequences

The contradictions that surround MCE have been present in schools for many many years. In a discussion of the meaning of public education for ethnic groups, Newman cites two radically conflicting views regarding the school's role in the acculturation of the American immigrant--one which promoted assimilation, the other which thwarted it. He further indicates that while there are important differences between the experience of the so-called new minorities (Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos) and white ethnics, historically, the basic scenario has been the same. Newman thus concludes:

> The standard textbook view that public education was designed to promote assimilation ignores an enormous conflict between ideology and practice in American public education. While ethnics of all kinds have been told that public schools would make them assimilated, socially mobile participants in American society, everything has been done in educational institutions (as elsewhere) to prevent those things from happening.[15]

Sullivan also notes the rhetoric--stated goals--vs. reality--actual educational practices--in a discussion of the historical perspective of the goals of American education. After reviewing six goal proposals covering a 45 year span, he observes:

> The goals stipulate what was felt to be basic values claimed by the "American Culture". One has to compare the development of these goals with the development of race relations going on concurrently in America to understand what is missing. In essence, during the time of significant development of educational goals and public education as we know it a whole host of negative assumptions concerning the major American cultural groups (minorities) were being formulated. . . .[16]

Such contradictions between professed goals and actual practices have caused obstacles to MCE. The following segment of the paper examines such obstacles.

Obstacles.

Lack of commitment and knowledge. Because American society has traditionally demonstrated monocultural majority attitudes and since educational institutions reflect, maintain, and reinforce the dominant society's values, there has been a general lack of commitment to MCE on the part of the schools.

Teachers, oriented to teach given grade levels or a specific content area (or areas), have generally espoused a respect for individual differences but have restricted their practices to individualizing instruction based on the academic performance or perceived ability levels of students. Cultural differences--the essence of cultural diversity--have received minimal attention overall and only recently have educational strategies been developed to build upon/strengthen/maintain those existing differences, rather than to extinguish them.[17]

There have always been those individual educators who have, philosophically at least, respected cultural differences and have had positive attitudes about them. Such educators have committed themselves to the philosophy of multiculturalism and felt a responsibility to provide education that was multicultural, but have not necessarily had a sound knowledge base, nor the instructional strategies that would enable them to translate their philosophical positions into actual classroom practices.

In contrast to those who are philosophically committed to MCE but lack the knowledge and skills to implement it, there are other educators who have felt no responsibility towards MCE. Such educators need multicultural knowledge and skills before they can take a supportive position. Specifically, educators need to be knowledgeable about: 1) the definitions of and rationale

for MCE: 2) the content of MCE; and 3) how to incorporate MCE into specific subject areas.

Lack of leadership. Traditionally the role of the school has been to perpetuate the status quo. Since monoculturalism (Anglo-oriented) has been the accepted standard, schools have perpetuated a climate of learning that places culturally different learners at a disadvantage educationally and too often renders them unable to alter their status in life.

It is within the school environment that all students first experience the labeling and categorizing that inevitably influences their other pursuits in life. While this can be rewarding for the advantaged, majority student, it is often disabling for many students, especially racial or ethnic minority students. Frequently labeled as "deficient", too many culturally different learners are placed into "educationally handicapped programs", and are ultimately denied entrance into mainstream society long after the termination of their formal school years. As Pettigrew asserts:

> The earliest and most fundamental lesson ethnic minority pupils in American schools learn is that they are second class citizens, the "inevitable" failures in the social and intellectual domains of American life. . . . They are outsiders, beyond the mainstream of white, middle-American rights, life, and luxury.[18]

As perpetuators of the status quo, schools have not taken a leadership role in affecting conditions conducive to MCE. Despite the facts that educational personnel: 1) admit their inadequate preparation to teach culturally different learners; 2) bear witness daily to the struggles and frustrations of culturally different students; and 3) acknowledge limited parental involvement, the schools are reactors rather than actors, followers rather than leaders, in formulating and implementing decisions that affect MCE. Leadership is lacking at all levels: administrative, building and within classrooms.

Ciles and Collnick have indicated the source of the leadership that

come about in regard to MCE, stating that:

> The most significant impact on the American educational system has resulted from the recent presence of non-white minority groups and their demands that the narrow cultural base of the public schools be expanded to respond to their needs. . . .[19]

Responding to group pressures, the courts and legal systems have been used to address/implement/enforce such demands.

Strategies

If MCE is to become a reality in American schools, it must be regarded as a priority by the institutional powers that give direction to schools. This means that state boards of education, the administrative staffs of state departments of education, local boards of education, and local administrative staffs must provide the leadership and commitment--financial and moral--to institute MCE.

Following the positive direction given by such leadership, building principals, teachers, and other educational personnel must then put MCE programs into actual practice. Because all of the financial support, curricular changes, and instructional materials that reflect MCE can be only as effective as the teachers and other educational personnel who provide instruction and direction, it is imperative that administrative personnel monitor the implementation of MCE.

Such implementation will require many changes. Because MCE should be regarded as a pervasive, positive, vibrant force which is both process and product, a multicultural learning environment should reflect a culturally diverse staff, students, community, curriculum, and instructional materials.

Since educational personnel have not had adequate preservice training in working with culturally different learners, it is necessary to offer ongoing inservice programs that will provide staff with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that enable them to be effective educators who endorse cultural

pluralism. Therefore, the following steps must be taken:

1) State departments of education and/or local administrative staffs must make a commitment to prioritize inservice programs that focus on MCE.

2) Ongoing inservice education programs must be conducted for educational personnel, administrative staff, and community persons.

These steps require that specific personnel be designated the full time responsibility of implementing MCE.

Note: It can not be over emphasized that MCE is imperative in monocultural as well as multicultural schools. MCE is essential then in order for students who grow up in monocultural atmospheres to develop positive multicultural attitudes. This means that monocultural schools should reflect culturally pluralistic staffs, curriculum, and instructional materials which will enable students in such settings to respond to the rewards and responsibility that accompany first-hand knowledge of America's cultural diversity.

Summary and Conclusions

The writers have examined the contradictions between what is professed in the American community, its higher education institutions, and its schools. Findings indicate that the "American dream" has too often been a "nightmare" for the culturally different.

In each sector of society the obstacles to MCE have resulted from the contradictions between rhetoric and reality and have focused around three concerns: lack of commitment, lack of knowledge, and lack of leadership.

Strategies have specified the need for: 1) prioritizing MCE; 2) exerting leadership to bring about commitment to the concept of multiculturalism; 3) implementing inservice programs at the community/university/school levels; and 4) conducting research that focuses on the positive effects of multicultural environments and teaching-learning styles as they relate to cultural differences.

of cultural pluralism.

The writers conclude that to continue educational practices that perpetuate status quo conditions in the face of needed changes is to denigrate the term education and ensures a nation of cultural illiteracy. However, if we choose to nourish our nation's body from the tree that bears the fruit of cultural literacy, then we will feed upon the notion that cultural diversity is more to be strengthened than weakened; more to be kindled than extinguished; more to be cherished than abandoned; and more to be revered than desecrated.

Footnotes

[1]James A. Banks. Multiethnic Education: Practices and Promises, Fastback 87 (Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1977), p. 11

[2]William A. Hunter, "Antecedents to Development of and Emphasis on Multicultural Education" in Multicultural Education Through Competency-Based Teacher Education, ed., William A. Hunter (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974), p. 21

[3]Sourcebook of Equal Educational Opportunity, 2nd ed. (Chicago: Marquis Who's Who, Incorporated, 1977), pp. 435-36.

[4]William Ryan defines "blaming the victim" as justifying inequality by finding defects in the victims of inequality. See William Ryan, Blaming the Victim, rev. ed. (New York: Vintage Books, 1976).

[5]For a definition of the term education that is multicultural, see Carl A. Grant, "Education That is Multicultrual and P/CBTE: Discussion and Recommendations for Teacher Education" in Pluralism and the American Teacher, eds., Frank H. Klassen and Donna M. Gollnick (Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education,1977), pp. 65-66.

[6]An explanation of intra-visitations is presented in Sheila Berry, Shirla McClain, Norma Spencer, Patricia Stewart, "Tomorrow is Today: Directions for Change". Paper presented at the National Association of School Psychologists Ninth Annual Convention, March 1977, Cincinnati, Ohio.

[7]Geneva Gay, "Curriculum Design for Multicultural Education" in Multicultural Education: Commitments, Issues, and Applications, ed., Carl A. Grant (Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977), pp. 100-102.

[8]See, for example, the school integration efforts that have been successful in United States Commission on Civil Rights, Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law, Desegregation of the Nation's Public Schools (Washington, D. D. : U. S. Government Printing Office, 1976); Garlie A. Forehand and Marjorie Ragosta, A Handbook for Integrated Schooling (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare/Office of Education, 1976).

[9]Clarence L. Barnhart, ed., The World Book Dictionary, vol. 1 (Chicago: Field Enterprises Educational Corporation, 1974), p. 704.

[10]Geneva Gay, "Curriculum for Multicultural Teacher Education" in Pluralism and the American Teacher, eds., Frank H. Klassen and Donna M. Gollnick (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977, p. 55.

[11]Sourcebook for Opportunity, pp. 36-37.

[12]Price M. Cobbs and Diane K. Winokur, Education for Ethnic and Racial Diversity (Los Angeles: Western Teacher Corps Recruitment and Technical Resource Center, University of Southern California, 1977), pp. 15-17.

[13]See Hunter, Multicultural Education Competency-Based, pp. 21-23; Grant, Multicultural Education: Commitments, pp. 3-5; National Council for the Social Studies, Curriculum Guidelines for Multiethnic Education (Arlington: National Council for the Social Studies, 1976).

[14]National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (Washington, D. C. : National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1977), p. 13.

[15]William M. Newman, "Is Multicultural Education a New Attempt at Acculturation?' in Multicultural Education: Commitments, Issues, and Applications, ed., Carl A. Grant (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977), pp. 47-48.

[16]Allen R. Sullivan, "Cultural Competence and Confidence: A Quest for Effective Teaching in a Pluralistic Society" in Multicultural Education Through Competency-Based Teacher Education, ed., William Hunter (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974), p. 62.

[17]See "Second Annual Report, National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education" in Sourcebook of Equal Educational Opportunity, pp. 88-106.

[18]L. Eudora Pettigrew, "Competency-Based Teacher Education: Teacher Training for Multicultural Education" in Multicultural Education Through Competency-Based Teacher Education, ed., William Hunter (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974), p. 72.

[19]Raymond H. Giles and Donna M. Gollnick, "Ethnic/Cultural Diversity as Reflected in State and Federal Educational Legislation and Policies" in Pluralism and the American Teacher, eds., Frank H. Klassen and Donna M. Gollnick (Washington, D. C. : American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977), p. 119.